



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

philosophy for generations to all those who are fitted to use it, and therefore, and for that reason alone, it has seemed well to indicate some of the needs which it does not meet. The faults which I have signalized are those which grew out of the plan, and touch the execution of the plan at only a few minor points. Indeed, Professor Diels himself will be the first to recognize that our disappointment is his own; namely, that he has not been able to give us the complete edition of the pre-Socratics for which we had hoped and has been compelled to content himself with issuing a handbook. Our gratitude for that which he has provided will be best shown by the diligent and intelligent use we make of it.

IOWA COLLEGE, GRINNELL.

W. A. HEIDEL.

MARIUS HÆGSTAD. *Hildinakvadet, med utgreiding um det norske maal paa Shetland i eldre Tid.* Christiania, 1900. Pp. x + 108.

On his journey to the Shetland isles in 1774 the Scotch scientist, George Low, collected some Specimens of the Norse Language, among which was an old lay recited to him by William Henry, a peasant from the island Foula. The Specimens also included the Lord's Prayer in Shetlandic and a list of Foula words. On his return to Scotland Low wrote a book concerning his journey to the Shetlands and a journey which he made to the Orkneys. His manuscript, which is dated 1777, included the ballad, to which he gave the title, "The Earl of Orkney and the King of Norway's Daughter: a ballad." Low's manuscript, which is the only one we have of the lay, is preserved in the Advocates Library, Edinburgh. The lay was first printed in Barrie's *History of the Orkney Islands*, 2nd edition, by James Headrick, London, 1808, and again in 1838 in the 1st number of P. A. Munch's "Samlinger til det norske Folks Sprog og Historie." Low's work was first published in 1879 by Joseph Anderson under the title, "A Tour Through Orkney and Shetland," by George Low, Kirkwall, Orkney. Studies toward an interpretation of the linguistically so difficult lay have been made by Professor Sophus Bugge, for whom a phototype reproduction of the pages in Low's manuscript which contain the lay were made in 1884 by Professor Joh. Storm, who that year was in Edinburgh. An edition of the lay with a commentary and translation into Old Norse by Professor Bugge is soon to appear. The present edition, which is therefore the first critical edition, is also based on the copy of 1884.

Prof. Hægstad's work purports to offer a correct interpretation of the text with an examination of its phonology, but the age and character of the lay and its relation to other northern forms do not fall within the scope of the author's work.

The manuscript reading of the lay is first given, together with the Lord's Prayer and the Norn word-list, with a chapter on the orthography and the general condition of the MS. This is followed by the corrected text (III), contents and notes to the text (IV), and the language of the lay (V) in which is discussed in detail the Old Norse vowels and consonants as they appear in the text, followed by a paragraph on Stress and one on Scotch-English influence. Chapter VI gives a resumé of results as to the language, and the position of the dialect in the Scandinavian group, which is followed by a glossary of Foula words occurring in the lay and the prayer and an autotype copy of the manuscript of the lay and Norn word-list. The author seems to have been fortunate in his interpretation of many difficult passages in the poem, and the work as a whole forms an interesting contribution to our knowledge of the history of Shetland "Norn." As the only literary relic in Old Norn, a dialect of West-Scandinavian which seems to occupy a position midway between Faroese-Icelandic on the one hand and West-Norwegian dialects on the other, it possesses considerable value linguistically and is not without interest as a piece of literature. The difficulty of interpretation has been due in large part to the extremely distorted condition of the language, but also partly to the numerous mistakes of the MS, which are of such a character as to show that Low himself could not have understood aught of what he wrote. Words are frequently split up and written as separate words, not only compound words, but also the preterite of verbs, where the preterite ending *de* is written as a separate word. Sometimes distinct words are written together as one, or a word is combined with a part of another word, as *voð lerdin* for *vodler din* (O. N. *vollr þinn*). Mistakes in the division of the verses are also common. The orthographic inconsistencies need, however, not always be attributed to Low. These may in part at least be due to the reciter of the lay, who could neither read nor write, but depended entirely on his memory of a lay, the meaning of which was not in all its parts clear to him, for he was unable to give Low a literal translation of it, though he gave the substance. At the time that the lay was written down Old Norn was in its last stages. William Henry, an old peasant of Foula, probably belonged to the last generation who had in youth been able to speak Norn. As late as 1700 the general character of the language seems to have been Norse.¹ In the eighteenth century the transition to Scotch-English became more rapid, and by 1800 Norn was no longer known, except by a few of the older generation living on the outlying isles to the North and the West, a form of Norn, however, that was undoubtedly more English than Norse, but which was called Norn by those who spoke purer English because of its archaic dialectal character. The

¹ Jakobsen, *Det norrøne Sprog paa Shetland*, København, 1897, pp. 4-10.

language of the lay is almost absolutely Norse. Out of 35 four-line stanzas, about 700 words, less than half a dozen are English. The word *yift* is Sco. *gif* and *askar* is the English *ask* with Norse inflection. Influence of Sco. *haly* is, of course, as the author says, possible in *halaght* (O. N. *heilaght*), though not necessary, cf. the words *heljahvarf* < *heillarkvarf*, and *to hent* < *heimta*, and *hemalt* < Sco. *haimald*, where *e* < *ei* represents an open e-sound (Jak. 169 and IX), which is probably the sound represented by the first *a* in *halaght*. The word *nam* is O. N. *nafn*, and has probably nothing to do with Sco. *name*, cf. Norse diall. *nam*. The author fixes the language of the poem at about 1700, though the ballad itself is undoubtedly much older, and so may contain words and forms that are older than 1700. A comparison with the language of the Lord's Prayer would suggest that the latter represents a somewhat later stage of Shetland Norn. Out of 60 words 6, or 10%, are English, *but*, *gainst*, *tempa*, *delivra*, *puri* and *glori* (§ 75), to which we may also add *for* and *forgive*, and possibly *doi* and *vill*, are part English. The language of the lay is somewhat archaic, but that of the prayer was nearer the language of the time, and may represent the condition of the Shetland language at about 1750 as it was in the island of Foula.¹ Some of the chief phonological characteristics of the lay are: O. N. *a* becomes *o* before *ng*, e. g., *gonga*, *fong*, as in West-Norwegian dialects, Nordfjord *longd*, Söndhordland. *long*, Sogn *laongd*, Ryfylke *longge*, cp. Voss *langu*. O. N. *á* usually becomes *o*, *bodin* (*bátrinn*), *grothe* (*gráti*). *E* > *i* before nasals, *in* (< *enn*), *linge* (< *lenge*), *tinka* < *þenkia*. cf. Söndmøre, Söndhordland and Sogn, Norway (author, p. 35). *É* sometimes becomes *ie*, *je*, as in *hien* < *hēðan* and *lia* < *lé* < *leid*. Cf. modern Shetl. dial. *hjéla*. and Icelandic *hét* (pron. *hjet*). *Ó* usually becomes *u*, as *fur* (vb. 3. S. *fór*), *i muthi* < *i móti*. This change had begun before 1360 in the Orkney-Shetland dialects (p. 38). *Au* is preserved in *brau* (O. N. *brauð*), but simplified to *u* in *ru* < *rauð*. The monophthongation of *au* in Shetland dates back as early as 1299 (p. 43, § 23, Note 2). The simplification of diphthongs is general, *ei* > *e* (*hem* < *heima*, *mere* < *meira*) before 1307, and *ey* > *eu*, pronounced *ö* (*meun* < *meyna*, *lever* < *hleypr*). This last change is found as early as 1355 in Shetland and 1496 in Orkney. The *a* of final syllables is kept whether after a short or long stem syllable, just as in Western Norway, in Sogn, Voss, Hardanger, Hordeland, Ryfylke, Jæderen and Lister. Recurrence to the unumlauted vowel is seen in *silkisark* < O. N. *silkiserk*, and *garedin* < O. N. *gerðinni*. In the compound *silkisark* the last element may be due to Sco. *sark*. Voiced spirant *ð* > *d* where

¹ The Shetland Lord's Prayer reads: Fy vor o er i chimeri, halaght vara nam dit. La Konungdum din cumma. La vill din vera guerde i vrildin senda eri chimeri. Gav vus dagh u daghloght brau. Forgive sindorwara sin vi forgiwa gem ao sinda gainst wus. Lia wus ekè o vera tempa, but delivra wus fro adlu idlu, for doi ir Konungdum, u puri, u glori, Amen.

kept—as in Norse—and different from Icelandic and Faroese. Finally and medially between vowels it is lost, as also in Norse, e. g.: *spirde* < *spurði*, *laghdè* < *lagði*, but *asta* < *af stað* (cf. Sogn.-Hardanger *asta-austa*), *bo* < *bæði*, *lian* < *leiðina*, *menn* < *mēðan*, *ro* < *ráða*. *Fn* > *mn* (and *m*) in *yamna namn* (*nam*), as commonly in Norse diall. *H* is frequently lost before a vowel, and has frequently developed initially before a vowel (cf. English, may be in part Sco.-Eng. influence). O. N. *hl. hr* > *l. r*. O. N. *hv* > *wh* on the East and *kw* on the West, the latter being pronounced *khw*, probably. An infixed *j* has frequently developed between an initial consonant and the following vowel, also frequently initially before a vowel, e. g.: *yilsa* < O. N. *heilsa*. This is very characteristic of the present dialects of Shetland. *K* has become voiced after vowel, e. g.: *bugin* < O. N. *bukinn*, *mege* < *mikit*, &c., so *tt* > *d*, e. g. *gede* < *getit*, as in Lister and Stavanger diall. in South-Western Norway. *Ll* > *dl* (*adlu*, *idlu*, *fodlin*, *godle*, *hadlin*, *spidla*, *vodlin*, *vodler*, as in Western Norway from Flekkefjord to Sogn. The combination *rn* > *dn*, as in Norway from Sogn to Jæderen. *Nn* > *dn* (*eidnar* < *hennar*, *idne* < *inni*, &c.), as is the case to a certain extent in Hardanger, Voss, Hordaland and Ryfylke in Norway (§§ 63, 3; 65, 3; 67, 3, and Larsen, *Over-sigt over De norske Bygdemaal*, 1898, pp. 66-77). The language of the Hildina Lay seems to be most closely related to that of Ryfylke in Western Norway. In general character the language of Orkney has been very much like that of Shetland. The voiceless stops seem to have become voiced to *b*, *d*, *g*, earliest in Orkney, while the O. N. diphthongs have been simplified earlier in the Shetland language.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

P. Ovidi Nasonis De Arte Amatoria Libri tres. Erklärt von PAUL BRANDT. Leipzig, Dieterich'sche Verlags-buchhandlung, Theodor Weicher, 1902.

Dr. Brandt dedicates his work to his friends in Leipzig and in his preface, which is also addressed to them, pays a warm tribute to the memory of Richard Richter.

The introduction of fifteen pages is mainly devoted to the contents of the poem itself and to some rather obvious conclusions and reflections suggested by them. It appears to have been written for the general reader. At all events, it is of no value to the scholar. This is somewhat disappointing when one considers the great importance of the *Ars Amatoria* as well as the number and variety of interesting questions which it suggests both as a document and as a work of art.

With the commentary, however,—which was, of course, the real object of the book—the case is different. It is written *con amore*. "Nicht weil es mir drängte, eine philologische Arbeit zu